REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, and 18-21 have been amended, and new claims 24-37 have been added to recite additional features of Applicants' invention.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious over Hanson in view of Steinberg. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites broadly various embodiments of the invention disclosed in the specification. In particular, claim 1 recites "if the text message transmission succeeds, confirming whether any further receiver terminals of the text message exist and, if no further receivers exist, returning to an idle mode." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Hanson discloses a voice mailbox system which stores messages in a plurality of electronic mailboxes. Each mailbox corresponds to a separate location in a storage unit. In operation, a user dials a telephone number to access the system. A message is then stored in one or more mailboxes. The message may be given an urgent status if desired.

However, the Hanson patent fails to teach or suggest performing certain functions depending on whether the message transmission was successful or not. That is, the Hanson patent does not teach or suggest taking any action based on whether or not messages are successfully stored in a mailbox of its system. Rather, a user merely calls a phone number to access the mailbox system and then leaves a message. It is just assumed from that point on

that the message was successfully stored. Accordingly, Hanson does not teach or suggest taking any action "if the text message transmission succeeds."

Hanson also does not teach or suggest that if a successful transmission occurs, "confirming whether any further receiver terminals of the text message exist and, if no further receivers exist, returning to an idle mode." (Emphasis added). That is, after a message is stored in one or more mailboxes, Hanson does not then confirm whether further receiver terminals for receiving the message, and if none exist returning to an idle mode.

Notwithstanding the above, even if the Hanson system did perform a check to determine whether a message was successfully stored in a mailbox, the Hanson system still would not form the claimed invention. In Hanson, a caller dials a phone number to access the mailbox system. Once in, the caller can store a message in multiple mailboxes, however those mailboxes do not constitute "receiver terminals," i.e., the mailboxes store messages for receiver terminals. They are not receiver terminals themselves, i.e., the terminals access the mailboxes to retrieve stored messages but the mailboxes are not receiver terminals. The mailboxes, rather, merely correspond to storage locations in memory. Therefore, Hanson does not teach or suggest transmitting a message to "the plurality of receiver terminals" and the "further receiver terminals" in claim 1.

To make up for the deficiencies of Hanson, the Steinberg patent was cited.

Steinberg discloses a system which transmits in message to different wireless devices owned by a same user. Transmission takes place in hierarchical form. That is, the message is first transmitted to the user's pager. If this transmission is successful, all further transmissions are stopped. But, if the transmission is unsuccessful, the message is sent to his

wireless e-mail, and if unsuccessful to his voicemail. A different order of preference may be specified.

While Steinberg determines whether or not a message transmission is successful, it does not teach or suggest "if the text message transmission succeeds, <u>confirming whether any further receiver terminals of the text message exist</u>." (Emphasis added). On the contrary, Steinberg makes clear that once a message is successfully transmitted to one of the user's terminals, the process stops (see Fig. 3B) - no confirmation is performed to determine whether further terminals are to receive the same text message. Thus, Steinberg teaches away from the claimed invention.

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that a Hanson-Steinberg combination cannot render claim 1 or any of its dependent claims obvious.

Claim 3 separately recites that the identification numbers are <u>phone numbers</u>. Hanson and Steinberg do not teach or suggest these features. In Hanson, only one phone number is dialed, specifically the phone number used to access the voice mailbox system. All numbers entered thereafter correspond to mailbox numbers or menu options, not phone numbers as recited. In Steinberg, only one phone number of the voice mail terminal is entered. All other wireless terminals are accessed using different numbers.

Also, claim 3 recites that the phone numbers are obtained from a "phonebook of the sender's terminal." Hanson and Steinberg do not teach or suggest that the phone numbers of the receiver terminals are input using a phonebook of a sender terminal.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 but also based on the features separately recited therein. Claim 6 recites similar features and therefore is also distinguishable apart from the features recited in its base claim.

Claim 5 recites inputting the identification numbers of the corresponding further receiver terminals and re-transmitting the text message to the further receiver terminals. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 7 recites that the identification numbers of the plurality of receiver terminals and further receiver terminals are inputted through a one-touch dial function. These features are not taught or suggested by the Hanson and Steinberg patents, whether taken alone or in combination. In Hanson, only one phone number is entered – that of the voice mailbox system. And in Steinberg, the numbers are pre-stored in a communications preference file of a computer system, which clearly does not correspond to a one-touch dial function.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is allowable over a Hanson-Steinberg combination, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 and intervening claims but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claim 8 recites broadly various embodiments of the invention disclosed in the specification. In particular, claim 8 recites "if the text message transmission succeeds, confirming whether any further receivers of the text message exist and, if the further receivers exist, sequentially transmitting the text message to the further receivers; and if no further receivers exist, returning to an idle mode."

The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features. As previously discussed, the Hanson patent never performs a check to determine whether the messages entered into its mailbox system have been successfully stored. As for Steinberg, this system performs check but does not then sequentially transmit the same text message to a different receivers (e.g., "further receivers"). Instead, Steinberg expressly discloses that its process stops after a successful transmission occurs. Steinberg, thus, teaches away from the claimed invention.

Claim 9 recites that the identification numbers are phone numbers registered in a phonebook of a sender's terminal. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features. Claim 12 is also distinguishable on these grounds.

Claim 11 recites "inputting the identification numbers of the corresponding further receiver terminals; and re-transmitting the text message to the further receiver terminals." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 13 recites determining the message transmission type for the further receiver terminals, before re-transmitting the text message to the further receiver terminals. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 14 recites that the identification numbers of the plurality of receiver terminals and the further receiver terminals are inputted through a one-touch dial function. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 15 recites broadly additional embodiments of the invention. In particular, claim 15 recites that "if the text message transmission succeeds, confirming whether any further receiver terminals of the text message exist; and if the further receivers exist, inputting the

identification numbers of the further receiver terminals and re-transmitting the text message to the further receiver terminals." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest performing a confirmation whether further receiver terminals for a text message exist, after the message was previously successfully transmitted to a plurality of receiver terminals. These patents also fail to perform the re-transmission step recited in claim 15, which also relates to the further receiver terminals.

Claims 16-20 recite features which separately distinguish these claims from a Hanson-Steinberg combination.

Claim 21 recites broadly additional embodiments of the invention disclosed in the specification. In particular, claim 21 recites continually inputting identification numbers of plural receiver terminals into a sender terminal "until every receiver terminal intended to receive the text message is identified." Then, the text message is collectively transmitted to the identified receiver terminals. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

In the Hanson patent, a user only inputs one phone number – the one corresponding to the voice mailbox system. All subsequent numbers identify mailboxes, not receiver terminals. In Steinberg, a text message is transmitted to multiple terminals, but the text message is not "collectively transmitted" to those terminals. Rather, the message is sent to a first terminal by itself. If an unsuccessful transmission occurs, then the message is sent to a second terminal. Thus, Steinberg fails to teach or suggest at least step (f) in claim 21.

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that a Hanson-Steinberg combination cannot render claim 21 or any of its dependent claims obvious.

Claim 22 recites determining whether the text message was successfully communicated to every receiver terminal identified, and "re-transmitting the text message to a group of the identified receiver terminals that failed to receive the text message, in accordance with a user command." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these steps.

Hanson does not perform a check to determine whether a message has been successfully stored in a mailbox, and even if it did the mailboxes of Hanson do not constitute receiver terminals. Furthermore, Hanson does not teach or suggest re-transmitting a text message to a group of the identified receiver terminals that failed to receiver the transmitted text message, based on a user command.

Steinberg determines whether a message was transmitted successfully, but does not teach or suggest re-transmitting the message to receiver terminals which failed to receive the message. In fact, Steinberg expressly teaches away from these features, i.e., when a message is unsuccessfully transmitted to one terminal of a user, Steinberg does not then try to re-transmit that message to the same terminal. Instead, it attempts to transmit the message to another terminal owned by the user.

Based on at least these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over a Hanson-Steinberg combination.

Claim 23 recites determining whether the text message will be sent to an additional receiver terminal, after the text message has been transmitted to the identified receiver terminals; repeating steps (b), (c), and (d) for each additional receiver terminal that is intended to receive the text message; and collectively transmitting the text message to each of the additional receiver terminals identified. The Hanson and Steinberg patents fail to teach or suggest these features.

New claims 24-35 have been added to the application.

Claim 24 recites "confirming that the text message was successfully transmitted to the plurality of receiver terminals, said confirmation performed before confirming whether any further receiver terminals of the text message exist." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not individually or collectively teach or suggest these features. Hanson does not perform any confirmation, and while Steinberg checks whether a message transmission was successful it does not confirm that transmission to multiple terminals are successful because it ceases transmission after the first successful transmission occurs.

Claim 25 recites that the transmitting step in claim 1 includes "transmitting the text message to the plurality of receiver terminals in response to a single user keystroke." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 26 recites that "the text message is collectively transmitted to the plurality of receiver terminals." The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features. The Hanson system transmits a message to multiple mailboxes, not to multiple receiver terminals. And Steinberg teaches away from claim 26 when it discloses transmitting a message to multiple wireless terminals one at a time, not collectively – i.e., Steinberg

transmits a message to a first terminal and waits to receiver a successful transmission confirmation. The message is transmitted to the second terminal if and only if the first transmission is unsuccessful. Thus the collective message transmission of claim 26 is not performed in Steinberg.

Claim 27 recites determining whether the text message was successfully transmitted to the plurality of receiver terminals, <u>said determining step being performed after the text message is collectively transmitted to the plurality of receiver terminals</u>. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 28 recites that the receiver terminals are mobile receiver terminals. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 29 recites that the text message is transmitted to the plurality of receiver terminals without first performing a check to determine whether successful transmission occurred. The Hanson and Steinberg patents do not teach or suggest these features.

Claims 30-37 also recite features not taught or suggested by the Hanson and Steinberg patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Samuel W. Ntiros**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK:SWN:JHB/par
Date: June 15, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610